

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

SEABOURN CRUISE LINE LIMITED,
HOLLAND AMERICA LINE NV,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ERIC J GOLDRING, GOLDRING
TRAVEL LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00999-BAT

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Defendant Eric J. Goldring and Goldring Travel LLC requests the Court to reconsider its Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion to Seal (Dkt. 42). Dkt. 48. The motion is denied.

DISCUSSION

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied unless there is a showing of (a) manifest error in the ruling, or (b) facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier, through reasonable diligence. CR 7(h)(1). The term "manifest error" is "an error that is plain and indisputable, and that amounts to a complete disregard of the controlling law or the credible evidence in the record." Black's Law Dictionary 622 (9th ed. 2009).

1 “[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual
2 circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed
3 clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *Marlyn Natraceuticals,*
4 *Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009). A motion for
5 reconsideration should not be used to ask a court to rethink what the court had already thought
6 through — rightly or wrongly. *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 909 F.Supp. 1342, 1351 (D.
7 Ariz. 1995). Mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration,
8 and reconsideration may not be based on evidence and legal arguments that could have been
9 presented at the time of the challenged decision. *Haw. Stevedores, Inc. v. HT & T Co.*, 363 F.
10 Supp. 2d 1253, 1269 (D. Haw. 2005). “Whether or not to grant reconsideration is committed to
11 the sound discretion of the court.” *Navajo Nation v. Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakima*
12 *Indian Nation*, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003).

13 Here, Plaintiff is simply rehashing arguments that the Court has already considered.
14 Plaintiff has shown no highly unusual circumstances, newly discovered evidence, clear error, or
15 an intervening change in the controlling law. Thus, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt.
16 48) is **DENIED**.

17 DATED this 12th day of September, 2022.

18
19 

20 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23